Dear Jim,

12/11/74

I had trouble deciding whether to write Bud last night. He is childish where his concept of importances in political assassinations is concerned. Long time ago it manifested itself in actions reflecting the belief that because he is Bud and because he spent his own money to organize a committee he owned the subject. Especially because he was so noble of purpose and unself in intent and he came to believe it genuinely, along with a paranoidal belief that the worse it proved itself to be the more he was beset by jealous enemies, of whom I'm chief.

Actually, a major part of his problem has two parts: his concept was impractically and was an abortion exactly as I told him it would when he asked me to join it and I refused (as a political infant should have known); and because if he didn't know before it and all that has happened since [illegible] with it, on the Ray case he has learned that he is utterly and completely incompetent in the filed and in some aspects of the law. He resents, deeply, his dependence first on me and then on you. And what he has seen that we do that he doesn't. It is a strange twist. A rational man would delight in it. He has acquired a cost-to-coast fund for work that was not his and of which he was incapable -often done over his objections - and that does not satisfy him and does, secretly, pull him.

Knowing this and more I was confronted with a problem when I heard from McKinley. Bud rarely reacts rationally/ when his ego is involved. So, I figured that whatever I told him he'd twist into me threatening him. Think is not the case. but what is real is that his own crazy behavior has brought about a situation I did describe to him. He can believe it or not. And because he wasn't dealing with you and me, people who in order to accomplish a socially-useful purpose have come to take his abuse although in his sickness of mind he twisted it this way and saw someone else getting attention he loves (and there would none for either of us in an interview). He rebelled and made up objections max that were they valid were premature and having satisfied his pure mind on this score he went crazy. He is so used to our taking it he does it automatically. Only this time it wasn't really us.

The realities of life and law and court decisions is that what McKinley has in mind serves Ray's interest in a way it has never been served. For the first time it is possible. It also served other interests. There is nothing bad in it.

However, this is not my point. Bud has a simple way out of this and I did not suggest it to him. He can go back to the reasonable position he took to my face, I now think never meaning it, and find out exactly what they have in mind. He can then decide, on that basis only, what he thinks of it. And there is no reasonable objection to what I've discussed with Jim. So, unless there is a change in it, I'm not abdicating my own judgement.

This would be hard on his ego. There is nothing I can do about that. Then Jim and Playboy will go ahead with their article which will be one of opinion. And if I am asked, for May publication, questions to which I think the time has come for an honest answer, I might decide that indeed the time has come and give a few honest answers.

What troubled me more is just having read the really fine job you did on mobilizing decisions on the obligations of a criminal lawyer especially as they relate to investigation. Bud has violated every one of those points. The only reason there was any investigation is because I did it. In no single case did he ever send me out on one, unless you call asking me to do even his work and actually drafting the affidavits investigation. And as you know, I elected and followed another course. And you drafted those affidavits. He never allowed me to go off on ANY investigating. Our original agreement was specific and contrary to this. The only investigating I've been able to do in the field was in every case incidental to something else and my election, my initiative. When there were specific investigations that clearly had to be made he refused to pay only the actual costs. (Wouldn't that look great is he has to face this questions sometimes!) And you saw that the minute the case was over except for the reading of the transcripts, while he did not again ask, direct or see the needs for further investigating, I went out on it. You saw some of the results, too.

My point here is not a threat, either. It is again a reality that becomes a very real threat because of what Hal does and does not do, not because of me.

At some point he, if he stays, is going to be in exactly the position you handle so effectively with Foreman. He has been in it all along except for me.

And I'm not going to remain in the position in which I have been about money with which to do the relatively inexpensive investigating that has to be done still. I am never again going to let him be in a position to insult and abuse me about it, either. And I think I'm also going to insist on pay, at the same rate he pays Ken, for his responsibility in a criminal case is no less than that for fatuats in civil cases.

I was troubled by two aspects of this: the reality, that Hal has been guilty of the same offenses you charge me with; and the fact that if I called this to his sick mind he'd read a threat into it. So, I omitted it. But with a man who allowed himself to be rational I certainly would not have.

Even the road there like these seems. I think you, too, should be aware that at some point we will have to face them and in the back of your mind have the question "how?" Under what conditions? If he again refuses an absolutely necessary investigatory expense what will we do?

Martin made a joke about seeing bridges to cross that were never crossed. We came to very few. But where we fell because we didn't see the bridge, in not one case was it that I hadn't seen the bridge. I see this one and I intend to begin holding Hal to the agreement he made at the outset. We haven't done all this work just to let him fuck it up to indulge his concept of self. And Hal isn't going to be hostage to his emotional needs.

I don't anticipate any need to have anything to do with Hal for the immediate future so I won't. He can do whatever he wants about the Playboy situation. But I also have and will use my freedom of judgment. If Hal doesn't straighten him head out and give good, solid tangible proof of it then he will have made my decisions for me. I have no intention of arguing with him about this or the money he owes me or anything else. He has it already wasted too much time for me.

The sacrifices of the past are over, too. I had no copies of *Frame-Up* with me when I could have sold them to people who wanted and needed them. I had none of the new book when it served our interest very much for me to have copies for the press. And I stayed off camera when being on would have been legitimate and the natural promotion of the new book also would have been.

For what he did and didn't do? Never again!

I think I carboned you, but if I didn't, prior to hearing from Jim I asked him to send me what Hal asked for, what they have in mind. Were I not convinced that the Jimmy interview is right, proper, necessary and the best approach I'd be pushing Jim to do a story and an angle one that would also be honest.

Sincerely,